

I think it is also important to recognize that when he got there, that that budget was back-ended. What he sent to us has most of the savings that he has proposed to occur in the seventh year of this budget, after he has left office assuming that he would be re-elected President again this fall.

It is a good start. It was important to get him to put it on the table. But it was never the objective of the new Republican majority in Congress simply to get a balanced budget. How we balance the budget is just as important as getting a balanced budget. The manner we go about it is just as important as achieving a balanced budget.

When the President put his budget that was in balance for the first time on the table in December, it should have been the starting point, not the end point, for negotiations to get us to a product that we can all agree to and accept. It is not a dollar question alone by any stretch of the imagination. To that extent the President is right. This is a debate much more fundamental than that. Republicans in this new majority believe in reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government. We believe in taking programs wherever we can and sending them back to the States and local governments for them to carry out their responsibilities, for them to make the decisions in welfare, in Medicaid, in crime fighting and many other areas. Big government in Washington and the way liberal Democrats that have run this place for 40 years before we came to be the new majority obviously did not believe that. President Clinton's rhetoric for quite some time in his first election campaign and through the past 3 years or so would have led one to believe that he somewhat sympathized with this. But I want to make it perfectly clear from my observations that that is not the way at all he is conducting himself now. He is kicking in with the big-government liberals that have run this place all these years. I think there is no better illustration of this anywhere than what has been put on the table in the negotiations here in January.

The Republicans in the congressional leadership put on the table a Medicaid proposal that was supported by 68 Democrats in this House, written by them basically, and the President said "no" to that. The Republican leadership put on the table a Medicare proposal that had the endorsement of 47 Democrats, and the President said "no" to that. And the Republicans put on the table a welfare reform proposal that had passed the other body that only had nine Democrats dissenting on it and the President said "no" to that. He does not want the changes that are proposed in that. He does not want to send the responsibilities largely back to the States to handle the programs that we have been unable to handle effectively and efficiently up here all the years we have been here.

We cannot have a credible balanced budget without doing that. We cannot

have a credible balanced budget without addressing the two-thirds of Federal spending that are in entitlement programs. Yes, we proposed some substantive changes in Medicare. The President proposes to demagogue that issue instead of addressing those substantive issues. What we have proposed, as I said, have been endorsed by a lot of folks as positive common sense.

We would protect under Medicare all of those opportunities for anybody who is on Medicare now to stay in traditional Medicare. If one wanted to take choices and leave and go and do some other things that we might suggest, we propose that, but we would increase, not cut, Medicare spending. It would be increased by more than 50 percent over the 7 years in the proposal we have put on the table, and anybody who says otherwise to the contrary is telling something that is not true.

We would increase the spending on Medicaid by more than 50 percent as well. There is absolutely no truth to the argument that Republicans are out to gut or cut or do anything dastardly to Medicare or Medicaid or any of these other proposals. We simply want to allow the States the opportunity to make many of these decisions and we want to have fundamental reforms that give people choices about how they are going to handle and conduct their affairs with regard to their future years and retirement. But President Clinton and the liberal cronies that created big Federal Government spending do not want any part of that.

When the President is serious and ready to negotiate a true balanced budget deal over 7 years, not just the numbers within the CBO system, but that gets us and moves us in the direction of reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government, then I believe we will sit down and have some hope of getting to a balanced budget. Until and unless that occurs, it is apparent that he wants to please the big government interests in his party as he goes into the election this fall and he does not want to face the tough choices that are involved that would have to drive some wedges in that core base of his, and he wants to spend the time demagoguing the Medicare and Medicaid issues for his campaign purposes. He does not sound serious to me.

If he wants to get serious, it is time that he get serious over the substance of this matter instead of the way he has conducted it so far. Let us get a balanced budget, but how we do it is just as important as doing it.

#### DEMOCRATS SEEK FAIRNESS IN BUDGET DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, we do have a new majority. Let us see what they have brought us. Well, basically we

have had a year of acrimonious and bitter debate. We have had a costly and wasteful government shutdown and we still have a budget stalemate. Why?

Well, the dust has settled and it is abundantly clear that the problem is the same problem it has always been. The Republicans want to give a big tax break to the wealthy. The Republicans want to give a big tax break to wealthy Americans.

We will recall first they said, give us a 7-year balanced budget, 7 is a magic number. The President has agreed to that. They then said no, we have to have CBO audited numbers, CBO real numbers. The President has given them that. They said they wanted to protect children and the future of our society, future generations.

But when the President of the United States presented a balanced budget, balanced in 7 years with CBO real numbers, what did they do? They walked away from the table. Why did they walk away from the table? The gentleman from Florida said it is how we balance the budget.

Well, they wanted to include a big tax break for the wealthy. The President has said he will not go along with that. The President and Democrats are for a balanced budget, but we believe it should not just be a balanced budget, it should also be a fair budget.

In truth, in point of fact, we should not have any tax breaks in this budget. If we are serious about balancing the budget and eliminating the deficit, we do not need to be taking money out of the Treasury in the form of a tax break. But again the President has been willing to compromise, and he has offered modest tax relief for education deductions and for people with children under the age of 14 for the true middle class.

But that is not good enough for the Republican new majority. They want to give tax breaks to people who make over \$100,000 a year. Ladies and gentlemen, if their package goes through, half of the tax breaks, half of the \$245 billion in tax breaks will go to the richest 2 percent of Americans. The richest 2 percent of Americans will get half of the tax breaks. That is not a fair balanced budget.

Let us move on and talk about Medicaid, because that specifically hurts our seniors and our disabled citizens. Item No. 1, there was not a single public hearing on specifically Medicaid cuts. Many people do not understand and say, well, this is another, quote, entitlement program.

In point of fact, nearly 60 percent of Medicaid funds pay for acute and long-term care and services for elderly and people with disabilities; 60 percent to the elderly and people with disabilities. Thirty-five percent pays for long-term care. That means when your mother or father or aunt or uncle or grandparents have to go into a nursing home, Medicaid is paying for that. Medicaid pays 52 percent of the Nation's nursing home bill. Why? Because nursing home care

is very expensive, and Medicaid also pays for home services for the frail and the disabled.

□ 1245

They want to cut Medicaid. They want to cut Medicaid and then send it to the State and say States can do it.

Well, I have been in the State government for 10 years as a State senator. They cannot do it if they do not have the money. So shaving this money and sending down the so-called block grant is no solution, because the States, in fact, under their new program, would be able to cut their funds.

This is not a balanced budget, not morally. It is an accounting device. But we want a balanced budget both from an accounting standpoint and a morally balanced budget that is fair to all Americans.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLING). With respect to a prior speaker, the Chair would remind the Member to refrain from reference to demagoguery of the President or other Members.

#### CASTRO'S CRACKDOWN ON DIS- SIDENTS AND INDEPENDENT JOURNALISTS DURING JANUARY CONGRESSIONAL VISITS TO CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, last week two Members of this House, a gentleman from Massachusetts and a gentleman from New Mexico, went to Cuba to meet with Castro. One told the press he was looking for flexibility on Castro's part to help him oppose the sanctions bill that the Congress is currently pursuing against the Cuban dictatorship. The other said he was seeking the release of some fugitives from American justice now in Cuba. I will now briefly outline some of the ways in which Castro reacted to these congressional visits and treated dissidents and independent journalists in Cuba just during these last few days.

JANUARY 14

Raul Rivero, Cuban poet and president of the independent Cuba Press agency, was arrested.

Juan Antonio Sanchez Rodriguez, another independent reporter, arrested in Pinar del Rio.

Jorge Adrian Ayala Corzo, president of the Democratic Renovation Party, was arrested.

Rafael Solano and Julio Martinez of the independent Havana Press were arrested.

JANUARY 15

Gladys Linares, Miguel Andres Palenque, Orlando Morejon were arrested.

Bernardo Fuentes, an independent journalist in Camaguey Province, was arrested.

Abel de Jesus Acosta, member of the Pro-Human Rights Party in Villa Clara Province, was arrested by State Security Lt. Boris Ruiz, his home ransacked and his motorcycle confiscated.

Jesus Zuniga, of the National Conciliacion Movement, was arrested.

The parents of Yndamiro Restano, were detained and interrogated for over 14 hours. Their son Yndamiro Restano, is the president of the Bureau of Independent Cuban Journalists who is out of Cuba on a visitor's permit due to a petition made to Castro by Dannielle Mitterand. They were told that if the bureau does not cease its work, they, as parents of Restano, will be faced with long-term detention and their son will be banned from returning.

JANUARY 16

The gentleman from Massachusetts arrived in Cuba. That day a meeting by the opposition umbrella grouping Concilio Cubano was disrupted in Havana by state security agents. Participants including Elizardo Sanchez and Marta Beatriz Roque were threatened with arrest.

Alberto Perera Martinez, vice-president of the Bloque Democratico Jose Marti was arrested.

Lazaro Gonzalez, president of the Pro-Human Rights Party, was detained and threatened.

JANUARY 17

The gentleman from New Mexico arrived in Cuba.

Jose Miranda Acosta, a political prisoner in a dungeon known as Kilo 5½ in Pinar del Rio was tortured by having water drops fall throughout the day and night into his cell. He has been sentenced to 15 years of confinement, without family visits, due to enemy propaganda. As a result of his imprisonment, he is practically blind and suffering from extreme malnutrition. Miranda has had his food poisoned in the past as punishment for a 72-day hunger strike in 1994, which he carried out to try to draw attention to his case.

JANUARY 18

Olanse Noguerras, vice-president of the Bureau of Independent Cuban Reporters, was detained after asking a question at a press conference held by the gentleman from Massachusetts in Havana.

Eugenio Rodriguez Chaple, president of the Democratic Bloc Jose Marti, was run off the road and injured by state security while on his way to meet with French Embassy officials.

Leonel Morejon Almagro, Concilio Cubano member, was detained and told that his family would suffer serious consequences if he continued to participate in Concilio and that the Interior Minister Colome Ibarra was giving him his last chance.

JANUARY 19

Both Congressmen returned from Cuba.

That day, Roxana Valdivia, an independent journalist was questioned at

state security headquarters in Ciego de Avila and threatened with exile or prison for disseminating enemy propaganda.

During the days of the congressional visits, the thousands of Cuban prisoners of conscience continued suffering the same savage brutality that they continue to suffer to this very moment. Col. Enrique Labrada continues to receive electroshock torture at the Mazorra institution for the mentally ill. Labrada was sent there after staging a pro-democracy protest last year. The Reverend Orson Vila remains in prison for preaching the word of Christ. A 30-year-old writer, Carmen Arias, remains in a dungeon for sending a letter to Castro asking for free elections, as do Sergio Aguiar Cruz, Francisco Chaviano, Omar del Pozo, and thousands of others.

Upon his return one Congressman declared that Castro is very flexible.

The other Congressman said that he had gotten Castro to reduce the amount of dollars that Castro charges some Cubans who are leaving Cuba, and that that constitutes a humanitarian gesture.

Mr. Speaker, what will it take for the world to help Cuba free itself of its tyrant?

Imagine if this were happening in apartheid South Africa or Pinochet's Chile.

#### CONSIDER PRIORITIES DURING BUDGET CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I was very surprised and disappointed when I saw that the Republican leadership walked away from the budget negotiations with the President about a week ago.

Frankly, I thought that the President went very far, maybe even too far, just before we adjourned 2 weeks ago when he not only agreed to a balanced budget, which we all support, but agreed to a 7-year budget, put it on the table, agreed to put forward a budget that was based on CBO estimates. The President essentially did everything the Republicans asked for as part of the negotiation and, instead of reacting and saying, OK, now we have a 7-year budget and it is CBO and it uses our numbers, instead of sitting down and saying now we can work out the differences over our priorities and still protect Medicare and Medicaid and the environment and education, instead they said, "No, that is not good enough. We are going to walk out. We don't want to have any negotiations." That is incredible.

We have gone on now for, I guess, about 6 months, and all during that time the Republican leadership has said that they supported the priorities of Medicare and Medicaid and also to